



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HJ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,482	06/28/2001	David D. Kloba	1933.001000C	4624
26111	7590	03/21/2006	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			WON, MICHAEL YOUNG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/892,482	KLOBA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Y. Won	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2 and 6-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2 and 6-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed February 13, 2006.

2. Claims 2 and 6-26 have been examined and are pending with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 9, 14, 15, 21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The amended claims mention above contain limitations that were not clearly supported by the original disclosure. The limitation of claim 9, "said generating means invoked by said first web page" and similar limitations of claims 14, 15, 16, 21, and 26 are not supported by the disclosure.

Although the disclosure states, on page 55, lines 8-11, "a script in the automatic channel Web page... automatically populates an automatic channel form for the Web site to be added", such teachings are clearly different than the limitation "generating means invoked by said first web page". Clearly, the first web page is not invoking anything, but rather the script within the web page. If the applicant(s) is intending to limit the claim with the steps recited on page 55 (184E), then they are encouraged to use terminology consistent with disclosure.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. For the reasons above, claims 9, 14, 15, 21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claims 9, 14, 15, 21, and 26 fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the reply filed February 13, 2006. In that paper, applicant has stated that support for the limitation "generating means invoked by said first web page" can be found on page 55, lines 8-11, and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because such support teaches that either a user or a script invokes the generating and not the first web page as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2 and 6-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6,182,113 B1) in view of King et al. (US 6,353,839 B1).

INDEPENDENT:

As per ***claim 9***, Narayanaswami teaches of a computer program product comprising a computer useable medium including control logic stored therein, said control logic enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, said control logic comprising; creating means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to create a bookmark to a first Web page (see col.1, lines 33-35 and col.4, lines 46-51); surfing means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to surf to a second Web page (see col.4, lines 13-18); invoking means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to invoke said bookmark, thereby navigating to said first Web page (see col.1, lines 39-41); and submitting means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to submit to establish said second Web page as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach of generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of

said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said generating means invoked by said first web page.

King teaches of generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser (see col.11, lines 57-62), said generating means invoked by said first web page (see col.6, lines 7-19).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of King within the system of Narayanaswami by implementing enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said generating means invoked by said first web page within the computer program product for enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices because King teaches that by employing such means, it allows the user to easily navigate to previously viewed contents (see col.11, lines 60-62) which overcomes some of the deficiencies encountered with handheld mobile devices (see col.1, lines 47-51).

As per **claim 14**, Narayanaswami teaches a method for a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, comprising the steps of: (1) creating a bookmark to a first object/resource (see col.1, lines 33-35 and col.4, lines 46-51); (2) surfing to a second object/resource (see col.4, lines 13-18); (3) invoking said bookmark, thereby navigating to said first object/resource (see col.1, lines 39-41); and (5) submitting to establish said second object/resource as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach (4) reviewing an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second object/resource, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said automatic channel form generated by said first object/resource.

King teaches (4) reviewing an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second object/resource, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said automatic channel form generated by said first object/resource (see claim 9 rejection and motivation above).

As per **claim 15**, Narayanaswami teaches of a computer program product comprising a computer useable medium including control logic stored therein, said control logic enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, said control logic comprising: creating means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to create a bookmark to a first object/resource (see col.1, lines 33-35 and col.4, lines 46-51); surfing means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to invoke said bookmark, thereby navigating to said first object/resource from a second object/resource (see col.1, lines 39-41); and submitting means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to submit to establish said second object/resource as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach reviewing means for enabling a processor to display an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second object/resource, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said automatic channel form generated by said first object/resource.

King teaches reviewing means for enabling a processor to display an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second object/resource, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said automatic channel form generated by said first object/resource (see claim 9 and motivation rejection above).

As per **claim 16**, Narayanaswami teaches a method for a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, comprising the steps of: (1) surfing to a web page (see col.4, lines 13-18); (2) invoking a link (see col.1, lines 39-41); and (4) submitting to establish said web page as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach (3) reviewing an automatic channel form created in response to step (2) that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser.

King teaches (3) reviewing an automatic channel form created in response to step (2) that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser (see claim 9 rejection and motivation above).

As per **claim 21**, Narayanaswami teaches of a computer program product comprising a computer useable medium including control logic stored therein, said control logic enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, said control logic comprising: surfing means for enabling a processor to surf to a web page in response to user input (see col.4, lines 13-18); invoking means for enabling a processor to invoke a link in response to user input (see col.1, lines 39-41); and submitting means

for enabling a processor to establish said web page as a channel in response to a user having submitted (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33). King teaches

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said generating means invoked by said invoke link.

King teaches generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said generating means invoked by said invoke link (see claim 9 rejection and motivation above).

As per **claim 26**, Narayanaswami teaches a method for a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, comprising the steps of: (1) creating a bookmark to a first Web page (see col.1, lines 33-35 and col.4, lines 46-51); (2) surfing to a second Web page (see col.4, lines 13-18); (3) invoking said bookmark, thereby navigating to said first Web Page (see col.1, lines 39-41); and (5) submitting to establish said second Web page as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach (4) reviewing an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser, said automatic channel form generated in response to step (3).

King teaches (4) reviewing an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via

interaction with a browser, said automatic channel form generated in response to step (3) (see claim 9 rejection and motivation above).

DEPENDENT:

As per ***claims 2, 10, 17, and 22***, Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach wherein said URL is determined using a script in said first Web page. King teaches wherein said URL is determined using a script in said first Web page (see col.2, lines 6-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of King within the system of Narayanaswami by implementing determining URL by scripts within the method and program product for enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices because King teaches that the scripts consider “user supplied information when displaying a hypermedia page” (see col.2, lines 6-9), which allows appropriate corrections or modifications to be made to the web page when the mobile device cannot handle an original web page due to limited memory, disk space, or processing power.

As per ***claims 6, 11, 18, and 23***, Narayanaswami further teaches wherein said URL of said second Web page is determined using a header (see col.5, lines 31-38).

As per ***claims 7, 12, 19, and 24***, Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach wherein said automatic channel form contains fields identifying any combination of a title and URL of a Web page, a maximum channel size, a link depth, whether images are to be included, whether to follow off-site links, and when to refresh. King teaches

wherein said automatic channel form contains fields identifying URL of a Web page (see col.11, lines 58-60)

As per **claims 8, 13, 20, and 25**, Although Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach of automatic channel (see claim 9 rejection above), Narayanaswami further does teach of further comprising the step means of modifying settings (see col.3, lines 7-12 and 13-17).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed February 13, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Applicant(s) arguments with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph has been addressed above and the rejection maintained.

B. With respect to claim 9, the applicant(s) assert that combinational teachings of U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,113 (*Narayanaswami*) and U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,839 (*King*) do not teach or suggest, "invoking a bookmark to a first web page to generate an automatic channel form used to establish a second web page as a channel for a mobile device".

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). There is no mention of a mobile device.

Even if the claim was directed to a mobile device, *King* clearly teaches of a “mobile device” (see Fig.1, #106) and generating “an automatic channel form used to establish a second web page as a channel”. In column 6, lines 7-19, *King* teaches of a dynamic web page generation, wherein a user inputs some information (inherently a first web page) and the information is incorporated into a “newly generated web page”. Clearly, such teaches explicitly teaches the above recited limitation.

C. Additionally, with respect to claim 9, the applicant(s) assert that combinational teachings of *Narayanaswami* and *King* do not teach or suggest “generating an automatic channel form” and directs the examiner to page 15, lines 16-19 and page 16, lines 24-25 of the specification for definition of a “channel”.

According to the specification “A channel is a collection of objects”. It is well known in the art that web pages comprise a collection of objects and therefore, a web page according to the definition is also a channel. Clearly in column 6, lines 7-19, King teaches of generating a channel (“newly generated web page”) comprising objects (“information” and “form data”).

For the reasons above claim 9 and similarly claims 14-16, 21, and 26 remain rejected.

Conclusion

7. Claims 2 and 6-26 have been rejected and remain pending.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Y. Won whose telephone number is 571-272-3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Won



March 16, 2006



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER